

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Little. Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of claim 2, and these claims are, therefore, not anticipated by Little.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Wells. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2 as well as other claims and is clearly not anticipated by Wells.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Wells in view of Pichereau. Wells is indeed a disposable processing article that is the precursor of the invention. Pichereau, however, bears no relationship to such an article. Pichereau is, instead, an inkstand. These articles are entirely disparate and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to the inkstand art for improvements to disposable processing articles.

Moreover, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended to recite that the helical floor of the second chamber partially surrounds the first chamber. Pichereau, on the other hand, shows no such structure because the sponge cup "g" of Pichereau is not a fluid chamber that is in fluid communication with the ink troughs "d." Thus, there is nothing in Pichereau that even remotely suggests the "circumferentially oriented" structure referenced by the examiner in the office action. Clearly, nothing in Pichereau provides any reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the article of Wells to provide the claimed invention.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Little in view of Coleman.

It is submitted initially that the premise of the rejection, namely that the only difference between the claimed invention and Little is a floating divider is not valid in light of the amendments to the claims. Further, it is submitted that the combination proposed by the examiner is untenable. Little teaches a device for cleaning, refinishing and lubricating rubber articles, such as tires, tubes, floor mats, weather stripping, moldings, stair treads, and rubber footwear. Coleman teaches a container for separating a fluid, such as blood, into a light phase and a heavy phase. There is,

therefore, no relationship whatsoever between these items that would provide any reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine their features. While the examiner does not propose any particular modification, applicants infer that the proffered combination is to use the floating element of Coleman in the device of Little. This modification has no support anywhere in the record and would, moreover, appear to result in an inoperative device. That is, providing the cleaning device of Little with an element designed to float in blood would only prevent the user of the Little device from inserting the brushes into the chamber having the piston 148, rendering the Little device inoperative.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY



Conrad J. Clark
Registration No. 30,340

Customer No. 22902
1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202-835-1111
Facsimile: 202-835-1755

Docket No.: 70869-0115US
Date: November 24, 2008